Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

THE JANOS, JOCOMES, MANSOS AND SUMAS INDIANS

By JACK DOUGLAS FORBES*

IN his *Memorial of 1630*, Father Alonso de Benavides remarks that in order to travel from Parral to New Mexico one must pass through the lands of several Indian tribes, among them being the Sumas and Hanos and other very ferocious tribes.[1] This is the first mention of the Hanos or Janos in Spanish documentary material, and it is rather interesting since, in a later period, the Janos were always located far to the northwest of the Parral-New Mexico route.

The next mention of the Janos is in connection with the general revolt of the tribes of northern Chihuahua which occurred in 1684. By that date a mission, Nuestra Señora de la Soledad de los Janos, had been established; however, its location is in doubt. According to Charles W. Hackett and Charmion C. Shelby, Soledad ". . . among the Janos Indians . . ." was located about seventy leagues to the southwest of El Paso,[2] thus in the vicinity of the later presidio of Janos. However, Peter P. Forrestal, in a note attached to Benavides' *Memorial of 1630*, asserts that La Soledad de los Janos was near San Francisco de los Sumas.[3] The latter mission was only a few leagues from El Paso. After the 1680's, however, the place-name of Janos definitely comes to be attached to the area of the presidio in western Chihuahua, and the Janos Indians seem to adhere to that same general vicinity.[4]

The entire territory supposedly occupied by the Janos was also occupied by the Sumas, and much later by the

* Graduate Student in History, University of Southern California.

1. Alonso de Benavides, *Memorial of 1630*, tr. by Peter P. Forrestal (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1954), p. 9.

2. Charles W. Hackett and Charmion C. Shelby, Tr. and Ed., *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians and Otermins Attempted Reconquest, 1680-1682* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1942), p. cxviii.

3. Benavides, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-11 note.

4. In 1683, the Mendoza-Lopez expedition noted a place called Nuestra Señora de la Soledad in Suma territory along the Rio Grande River; this further confounds the Janos and the Suma, of course.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

Apaches. The early Franciscans and Jesuits in Sonora and in the Casas Grandes area do not mention the Janos at all. On the contrary, the entire area north and east of the Opatería (Opata-land) was said to be occupied by the Sumas of the north and the Sumas of the east. In the 1640's and 1650's many of these wild Sumas were partially missionized by the fathers of Sonora, and in the 1660's missions were established for them at Casas Grandes, Carretas, Torreon and San Francisco de los Sumas near El Paso. The location of Carretas seems to have been on or near the Rio Carretas which is north of the presidio and town of Janos. The *Rudo Ensayo* definitely assigns Carretas to the Suma nation.[5] Thus it is clear that the area known by the place-name "Janos" was well within the territory of the Sumas.

An explanation may well be that "Janos" refers to a locality, or village, and that the Janos Indians were Sumas who lived in the vicinity of, or at, "Janos." This explanation is borne out by the fact that Father Eusebio Kino speaks of the Hocomes, Xanos Sumas, Mansos and Apaches and then a little later speaks of the Hocomes, Sumas, Mansos and Apaches.[6] It is possible that Kino meant to place a comma between Xanos and Sumas; however, the fact that he doesn't mention the Xanos at all, but only the Sumas, a few lines later, would seem to indicate that he really meant the Sumas of Janos. At any rate, this is only a clue, for Kino at other times refers to the Janos and Sumas as if they were separate groups.

The evidence is overwhelming, however, that the Sumas and the Janos occupied the same territory during the period 1630-1684. In August, 1680, two Jumas (Sumas) Indians were arrested for plotting a revolt and the cause of the trouble was a mulatto who was on the Rio de los Janos. (The Mulatto servant had cut off an Indian's ears, it seems.) In other words, we find Sumas Indians causing trouble on the

5. *Rudo Ensayo*, tr. by Eusebio Guiteras (Tucson: Arizona Silhouettes, 1951), p. 115.

6. Eusebio Kino, *Las Misiones de Sonora y Arizona* (Mexico: Editorial "Cultura," 1918-1922), p. 61.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

Rio de los Janos, thus confirming the view that the area of Janos, *i. e.*, the area of the Janos Indians, was occupied in 1680, as in the 1640's and 1650's, by Sumas Indians.

After the general revolt of the 1680's, the Sumas gradually disappear from the western half of Chihuahua. The Janos Indians continue to be mentioned until 1710, although references to them are sparse after 1701. In 1706 a "new conversion of the Xanos" in the El Paso area is mentioned, but generally, after the 1680's, the Janos are located in association with the Jocomes in the Chiricahua Mountain area of southeastern Arizona. In all probability the Janos Indians, *i. e.*, the Sumas of the Janos River area, retired to the north after the failure of their revolt of 1684-1686. Thus they were generally known as "Janos" until the early 1700's, gradually merging into the Chiricahua Apache (along with the Jocomes) after about 1710. The fact that the Sumas cease to be mentioned in western Chihuahua after 1698 or so may possibly be explained by the fact that those who remained in revolt were called by other names, *i. e.*, Apaches, Janos and Jocomes, and that those who made peace and were missionized merged into the Hispano-Mexican population and lost their tribal identity.

The problem of determining the tribal identity of the Janos is intimately connected with the problem of identifying the group known variously as the Ojocome, Hocome, Jocome, Jocomes, Jocomis, and Jacones. Unlike the Janos the Jocomes were generally assigned a definite homeland, it being the territory between the Sobaipuris settlements of the San Pedro River valley and the Chiricahua Mountains, and between the Gila River valley and the northern border of Opatería.

The Jocomes are first mentioned in connection with the general revolt of 1684-1686, despite the fact that both Franciscans and Jesuits had been in northern Sonora and Chihuahua from the 1640's. For forty years, instead of the Jocomes one finds that the Sumas or the Sumas of the north are the next group above Opatería. Fray Alegre reports in 1649 or 1650, for example, that the Suma or Yuma, ". . . a

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

numerous and fierce nation, had kept in continuous unrest the Franciscan missionaries who were laboring in the district of Teuricachi."[7] In 1653, or thereabouts, it was reported that the Cuquiarachi-Teuricachi-Huachinera district (in other words, northern Opatería) was bordered both on the north and on the east by the Sumas. It is further stated that the ". . . Suma of the north are being reached by the light of the Gospel with our entry into Teuricachi . . . ,"[8] thus clearly implying that Opatería was bordered by Sumas on the north, *i.e.*, in what was to be Jocome territory by the 1680's.

Thus the Jocome problem is similar to that of the Janos, both being involved with the Suma. An explanation may well be that the Sumas of the north simply became known as the Jocomes, the Sumas of the east became known as the Janos, and the Sumas of the El Paso-Rio Grande area continued to be known as Sumas. However, it is also possible that the Sumas of the north were effectively missionized in Opata villages and that the Jocomes drifted southward into the aboriginal Sumas territory. The likelihood of this latter possibility is minimized by other evidence, as we shall see.

In the 1680's, 1690's and early 1700's, the Jocomes were always closely associated with the Janos, Apaches, and Sumas in warfare against the Spanish and their allies in Sonora and Chihuahua. In fact, the Jocomes are almost always coupled with the Janos and the Apache. Francisco del Castillo Betancourt, in a letter of July 16, 1686, makes this union (with the Janos) complete when he says that he had an interpreter for Jano and Ojocome ". . . all of which is one language."[9] Thus it can be established that the Janos (*i.e.*, the Sumas, if the foregoing explanation is correct) and the Jocomes were of the same linguistic affinity.

The Jocomes, as was previously stated, occupied the territory directly north of Opatería, east of the San Pedro River valley and had their chief headquarters in the Chiricahua

7. Carl Sauer, "The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in North Western Mexico," in *Ibero-Americana*, Vol. V (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1934), p. 70.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 71, quoted from the *Relacion del Estado* of the missions mentioned.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 75. The letter is from the Parral Archives.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

Mountains. In 1695, Kino reports that, in order to reach Pimería Alta, the garrison of Xanos had to pass through the lands of the Hocomes and Xanos and that ". . . in those lands, in the Serro de Chiguicagui, they found almost all the spoils of . . . many robberies . . . [and that] among these Hocomes were found the spoils . . ." of a Spanish soldier who had been their prisoner.[10] The Sierra of Chiricahua continued to be a stronghold of the Jocome until the early 1700's when it became an Apache stronghold.

Teniente don Cristóbal Martín Bernal, in the report of his expedition to the San Pedro River valley in 1697, definitely locates several Jocome villages to the east of that valley. One of them was due east of Aribabia (Arivaipa) and had been abandoned. Another had been located up the valley of Babicoida where a group of Sobaipuris had been living in common with the Jocome.[11] This is interesting because the territory so described was, at a later date, the home of the Apache, and more significantly of the Chiricahua Apache. The latter were so-called because they had their major stronghold in the Chiricahua Mountains, as did the Jocome. Thus it would seem plausible that the Jocome were the Chiricahua and that the latter name, along with Apache, simply came to replace "Jocome" after 1710 or thereabouts.

If this explanation is correct, that is, if the Jocome were Apache, then the Janos would also be an Athabascan-speaking group and, probably, the Sumas would be one as well. Since it has commonly been thought, by Carl Sauer and others, that the Sumas were non-Athabascan, it would be well to examine this problem still further.

In 1698, Captain de la Fuente of the presidio of Janos carried on peace negotiations with the united Jano and Jocome and with some Sumas. De la Fuente remarks that ". . . otherwise they have relations only with two *other* rancherias of Apache, who also desire to make peace." The word "other" implies that the above tribes were also Apache; but de la

10. Eusebio Kino, *Historical Memoir of Pimería Alta*, ed. by Herbert E. Bolton (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1919), Vol. I, p. 145.

11. Fernando Ocaranza, *Parva Cronica de la Sierra Madre y las Pimerias* (Mexico: Editorial Stylo, 1942), p. 40.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

Fuente goes on to add that a deerskin was produced by a Jocome as a peace token. The deerskin was variously decorated and was sent by ". . . the chief of his nation and those of the Jano, Suma, Manso, Apache . . ." and others. On the deerskins were designs representing six *tiendas* of the Apache nation and 120 marks painted in the mode of wigwams *(jacales)* in four divisions to represent four villages of Janos, Jacomes, "Mansos" and Sumas.[12] This is significant since the ceremonial deerskin was, and is, used frequently by the southern Athabascan tribes.

The identity of the Jocome with the Chiricahua Apache is definitely established, however, by the fact that Jocome appears to be a Spanish derivation from the Apache name of one of the Chiricahua bands, the precise band which occupied the same territory assigned to the Jocome. This group of Apache called themselves Cho-kon-nen or Cho-kon-e. The Spanish commonly substituted the letters X, H and J for the gutteral Indian CH and thus Chokone would have been rendered Hokone, Xokone or Jocone.[13] This corresponds closely with the Hispanic Jacone and Jocome. Thus the Jocome and the Jano are established as being Athabascan-speaking people.

It has been shown previously that the Sumas were counfounded with the Janos, and that the latter probably were a local branch of the Sumas. Likewise it has been shown that the Sumas were confounded with the Jocomes. Therefore, it would seem likely, at this point, that the Sumas were also an Athabascan-speaking group. However, an examination of this problem will be dealt with subsequently.

The Mansos have already been mentioned in connection with the foregoing tribes with whom they were in close alliance during the 1680's and 1690's. The fact that the Mansos

12. Carl Sauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-76.

13. For example, we find the word Jumano being rendered variously Choma, Chomas, Xumano, Xumanes, Jumano, Jumanes etc. See Herbert E. Bolton, "The Jumano Indians in Texas, 1650-1771," in *Texas Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XV, No. 1, July 1911, p. 77, and France V. Scholes and H. P. Mera, "Some Aspects of the Jumano Problem," in *Contributions to American Anthropology and History* (Washington, D. C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1940), Vol. VI, pp. 265-299.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

were always closely involved with the Jocomes, Janos, Sumas and Apaches might be enough to link them with the latter; however, because it has commonly been supposed that they were non-Athabascan, more evidence is necessary.

The Mansos appear to have inhabited the Rio Grande River valley from the area of El Paso north to Las Cruces. They may have been known in 1582 by the name "Tampachoa," however, the first positive mention of them is by Juan de Oñate. He referred to them as Mansos because of the Indians' attempt at saying that they were friends and peaceful. Thus "Manso" was never a tribal name and was evidently used to refer to only a few rancherías of Indians in the El Paso area.[14] Benavides, in 1630, described these Indians as being nomadic and non-agricultural. Thus, culturally, the Mansos were set off from the Pueblo tribes and from the Uto-Aztecans of northern Mexico and were related to the nomadic Athabascans.

Missionary work among the El Paso natives was attempted several times. In 1659 Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de los Mansos was established. It appears that the natives were gradually "civilized" until the 1680's. In 1684-1686 the Mansos became involved in the general northern revolt and are mentioned as being allies of the Janos, Jocomes, Apaches and Sumas until at least 1698.

Aside from the fact that the Mansos were allied culturally and militarily with the Athabascans, we have only a few indications regarding their ethnic affinity. Two letters of Governor Vargas of New Mexico, written from El Paso in 1691 and 1692, are significant. Vargas says that the Sumas, the ranchería of Mansos under their captain who was called *"El Chiquito,"* and the Apaches of the Sierra de Gila were the greatest trouble-makers in the vicinity of El Paso. He further states that "all [of the above tribes] were in communication with the Mansos, who had left when the presidio was established at El Paso in 1683, but who had since been

14. Bandelier held that the Manso were originally from Las Cruces and were moved to El Paso during missionization. However, Benavides and Oñate (1630 and 1598) clearly show that the Mansos were living at El Paso in aboriginal times.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

converted . . . and settled near the church of San Francisco de los Mansos, 8 or 9 leagues from El Paso. The Apaches often visited them in groups of 2, 4 and 6, and it was quite customary for them to inter-marry, as was also the case with the Sumas. The Sumas of Guadalupe and Ojito were the scourge of the entire region."[15]

The above statement of Vargas not only reveals that a very close relationship existed between the Apaches, Mansos and Sumas, but it also mentions San Francisco de los Mansos (which earlier was known as San Francisco de los Sumas) and the Sumas of Guadalupe, which place was previously a Mansos mission. Thus it seems that the Sumas and Mansos were confounded with each other in 1692.

Of more significance is a letter of Father Marcos de Loyola of Chinapa (Sonora) to Vargas written in 1691. Father Loyola asked for help in pacifying the hostile Jocomes, Janos and Sumas, but more significantly he asked ". . . for one or two Manso Indians from El Paso. These had authority over the Janos and Jocomes. Two Spanish-speaking Mansos might be used to advantage on embassies of peace to negotiate with the enemy. On March 20, six Mansos with provisions and beasts of burden were on their way to Chinapa." They reached Janos on April 16, 1691, and ". . . with their assistance it was discovered that the Apaches of the Sierra de Gila, confederates of the Janos, Jocomes, Pimas, Sobas and Sumas were the trouble-makers." The Mansos ". . . were unable to negotiate with the uncompromising Apaches, and the plan to use them as mediators was abandoned."[16]

The above information is, of course, good evidence that the Manso language was Athabascan. Father Loyola and the other Spaniards seem to have felt that *any* Manso, so long as he spoke Spanish, could be used. Thus, either all Mansos were bilingual in the several Indian dialects or else the dialects of the Jocomes, Janos, Sumas and Gila Apaches were close to, or identical with, Manso. The statement by Father Loyola

15. José Manuel Espinosa, "The Legend of Sierra Azul," in the *New Mexico Historical Review*, Vol. IX, No. 2, April, 1934, pp. 127-128.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 129.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

that the Mansos had authority over the Janos and Jocome clearly implies a tribal relationship. We may conclude that the Mansos, along with the Janos and Jocomes, were of Athabascan stock.

The evidence seems to link the Mansos with the Sumas as well as with the Janos, Jocomes and Apaches, and it may be possible that the Mansos were simply Sumas living in the El Paso area. If this is the case, then the Rio Grande Sumas may well be an Athabascan group since the Sumas of Sonora and western Chihuahua have already been linked with the Jocomes and Janos. Kino gives some evidence in support of this when he wrote, in 1698, that for more than fifteen years the ". . . jocomes, janos, yumas mansos y apaches . . ." had made war upon Sonora.[17] Now the question is — what does Kino mean by yumas mansos? He may mean Sumas who are tame or missionized, but this is unlikely if they have been waging war for fifteen years. In all probability it refers to Sumas who are also called Mansos (in El Paso?), thus linking the two groups together.[18]

It is also clear that "yumas mansos" is no error in punctuation since the same phrase is used elsewhere by Kino and others. In a letter from Kino to Father-Visitor Horacio Polici the former states that he hopes to get a Pima-Sobaipuris alliance against not only the ". . . jacones indians, but also their allies the janos, the apaches and the yumas mansos."[19] Material from the Archivo General de la Nación in Mexico corroborates this. The material reports that "It makes fifteen years that the jacones indians, janos, apaches, the yumas indians named mansos [yumas titulados mansos], maintain their hostility, their robberies . . ." etc.[20] This indicates that the Sumas referred to were known as Mansos for it would

17. Eusebio Kino, "Breve Relacion," in *Documentos Para La Historia de Mexico* (Mexico: Vicente Garcia Torres, 1856), Tomo Primero, Tercera Serie, p. 810.

18. The name "Yumas" was used in the 1600's to refer to the Sumas. [The Yuma Indians of the Colorado River were never known as such until the 1690's.] Alegre, in 1649 or 1650, refers to "the Suma, or, according to other manuscripts, Yuma . . ." (See Sauer, *op. cit.*, p. 70). The Sumas were also known as the Zuma and Juma at various times.

19. Fernando Ocaranza, *Parva Cronica de la Sierra Madre y las Pimerias*, p. 66. From "Cartas del Kino al P. Visitador d. Horacio Polici, MS. T. 16-AGN-Historia."

20. Ocaranza, *ibid.*, p. 53.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

hardly make sense to translate the passage as "the yumas indians named (or entitled) tame." At any rate, when coupled with the other evidence, the above indicates a connection between the Sumas and the Mansos.

Evidence has already been presented which leads one to suspect that the Sumas were an Athabascan-speaking people closely associated with the Apaches, Janos, Jocomes and Mansos, and if it were not for the fact that Carl Sauer, France V. Scholes and others have supposed that they were Uto-Aztecan the discussion might well end here. However, the arguments and evidence of Sauer and Scholes must be considered since these two scholars have done much work in the north Mexican-New Mexican area.

Carl Sauer's argument is historical in nature and rests primarily upon the reports of the Espejo expedition of 1582. The latter group traveled to the junction of the Conchos and Rio Grande rivers and thence along the Texas side of the latter river to the El Paso area. The several accounts differ in detail (*i.e.*, the Luxan account and the Espejo account); however, one can gather a certain amount of fairly reliable information. It seems that after leaving the territory of the Tobosos,[21] the party reached a group of Indians, housed in five settlements, known variously as the Patarabueys, the Otomaoco and, by Espejo, the Jumanos. The group then traveled some forty or forty-five leagues up the Texas bank of the Rio Grande, meeting various groups of Otomaoco or related Indians. Then followed eight leagues through Caguetes or Caguase territory (a group related, it seems, to the Otomaoco) and thence ten leagues to the territory of a different group, the Tanpachoa.

Sauer reasons that since the Conchos Indians lived along the Conchos River to its junction with the Rio Grande at a later time, and since the Espejo-Luxan records indicate the

21. The Tobosos have been classified tentatively as Athabascan. If this is correct then the Sauer-Scholes Uto-Aztecan theory would be rather difficult to accept because it would place a Uto-Aztecan group in the middle of Athabascan territory. Since these groups were nomadic, such a situation would be difficult to account for.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

same language group at the junction and for some fifty leagues up the Rio Grande, the people, *i.e.*, the Sumas and the Jumanos, who later lived on the Rio Grande below El Paso, must have been linguistic relatives of the Conchos. Actually very little is known of the Conchos, but three words (for corn, water and each other) which have been recorded indicate a Uto-Aztecan affinity.[22] From this, Sauer concludes that the Patarabueys-Otomaoco, the Jumanos and the Suma were probably Uto-Aztecan.[23]

The above argument fails, however, because the Patarabueys-Otomaoco lived at the junction of the Rio Grande and the Conchos rivers, and along the Texas bank of the former for some fifty leagues. The Sumas on the other hand lived on the Chihuahua bank and did not reside near the junction, as far as is known. It seems that both Scholes and Sauer assume that after sixty leagues of travel, the Espejo group was in the El Paso area; however, Alonso de Posada (1686) gives the distance from Guadalupe (El Paso) to the junction as 100 leagues, and this is confirmed by other sources.[24] Thus the Espejo group was only half-way to El Paso when it left Otomaoco territory. In other words, the territory of the Otomaoco does in no way correspond to Sumas territory as it was commonly known. Rather, the Tanpachoa may be said to have lived on that part of the Texas bank which was opposite the Sumas side of the Chihuahua bank. Thus, in all probability, if any of these early groups relate to the Sumas it would be the Tanpachoa, and even Sauer indicates that the latter had a different language and culture from the Otomaoco.[25]

Sauer, however, maintains that the Sumas were merely western Jumanos, and by relating the Jumanos to the Uto-Aztecans he links the Sumas to that linguistic family. The Jumano problem is too complex to be dealt with fully here, but the question cannot be ignored, and the connection between the Jumano and the Suma should be examined.

22. A. L. Kroeber, "Uto-Aztecan Languages of Mexico," in *Ibero-Americana*, Vol. VIII, 1934, pp. 13-15. Kroeber says that none of the known Suma and Jumanos words are ". . . patently Uto-Aztecan."

23. Sauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-69.

24. Alonso de Parades, "Utiles y Curiosas Noticias del Nuevo Mexico," in *Documentos Para La Historia de Mexico, op. cit.*, Tomo Primero, Tercera Serie, p. 213.

25. Sauer, *op cit.*, p. 66.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

It seems that Espejo links the Jumano of the Pecos River (a buffalo-hunting group living in wigwams) with the Otomaoco-Patarabueys of the junction area while Luxan maintains a distinction between the two. It is certain that, culturally, the two groups were distinct, and since Luxan and Espejo disagree it is hard to see how the Jumano can be said to be Uto-Aztecan, especially since the word "Jumano" was later used to refer to peoples speaking Piro, Athabascan or Yuman, and possibly Caddoan dialects. Likewise, the connection between the Sumas and the Jumano is rather slim. The Spanish occasionally referred to a group known as the Sumana or Zumana and Sauer attempts to show that Suma and Jumano are forms of the same word. Such may be the case; however, until the Jumano are identified and as long as other evidence points to an Athabascan affinity for the Sumas, it would seem useless to suppose that a Suma-Jumano identity would prove anything.[26]

The Espejo expedition of 1582 and the Chamuscado expedition of 1581 are actually very poor bases for any arguments relating to the identification of tribal groups. The Luxan and Espejo accounts of the 1582 journey differ in important details and it is really impossible to say which one is more reliable; furthermore, the information given by Baltasar de Obregon contradicts not only Espejo and Luxan but Sauer as well. In regard to the Chamuscado expedition of 1581 Obregon clearly states that the people of the junction of the Conchos River and the Rio Grande had a different language and different customs from the Conchos.[27] He further indi-

26. It may be that the Jumano of Texas were Athabascan. The description of the Pecos River Jumano of 1582 certainly corresponds to a description of the Lipan Apache, and the entire territory of the southern Jumano was later Apache territory. Likewise, in Texas, the Spanish often referred to the Apaches Jumanes in the 1730's and 1740's. See Herbert E. Bolton, "The Jumano Indians in Texas 1650-1771," *Texas Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XV., No. 1, July, 1911. Thus the Jumano whom Sauer was trying to relate to the Suma may have been, and probably were, Athabascan. The word Jumano, in its various forms, was used by the Spanish to refer to many different groups. The above analysis refers, however, only to the Jumano of Texas, mentioned off and on from 1582 to 1771. By 1773, the Jumano of Texas had come to be regarded as a part of the Apache.

27. George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey, Tr. and Ed., *Obregon's History* (Los Angeles: Wetzel Publishing Co., Inc., 1928), p. 276.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

cates the same in regard to the Espejo journey.[28] Thus we have definite evidence here that if the Conchos were Uto-Aztecan (as seems likely) then the Otomaoco-Patarabueys-Jumano of the junction were certainly *not.* It seems then that the Sauer-Scholes thesis of a Conchos-Jumano-Sumas linguistic identity is an impossibility. This without even taking into consideration the great ambiguity connected with the whole Jumano tribal theory.[29]

As has been previously pointed out, the Sumas were almost always in close alliance with the Apaches.[30] Spanish documents refer to cooperation between the two above groups beginning with 1682 and ending about 1773. In 1682, Governor Otermín believed that the Sumas were maintaining treasonable relationships with the Apache. This belief was confirmed by the discovery of Sumas holding "friendly conversations" with some Apaches at an Apache "rancho."[31] This is the earliest reference to Apache activity in Chihuahua and of Sumas friendship with them. The close alliance of the two groups was very much in evidence throughout the 1680's and 1690's, as has been indicated.

After the subsidence of the turmoil created by the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 and its successors, the northern revolts of 1684 and 1690, many of the Sumas gradually made peace and some of them were settled at the Real of San Lorenzo and at Nuestra Señora del Socorro, both near El Paso. in 1706,

---

28. *Ibid.*, pp. 317-318.

29. As indicated previously, to prove that some group is related to the Jumano really proves nothing since there never was any one Jumano tribe. The term was used to refer to several distinct groups, i. e., the Piros-Jumanos-Pueblos, the Jumanos-Apaches of Texas, the Jumanos of the plains (Wichitas?) and the Jumanas of the Sierra de Azul (Yavapai or Apache). Thus the term "Jumano" evidently never meant a tribe, but rather referred to a cultural phenomenon probably meaning "painted people" or *Rayados. "Rayados"* was often used interchangeably with "Jumanos" by early Spanish writers.

30. The Mendoza expedition to the Jumanos in 1683 noted that some of the Sumas of the Rio Grande were having trouble with the "Hapaches." The latter were probably Apaches of Texas who often fought against other Apache groups. See Herbert E. Bolton, *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest* (New York: Charles Schribner's Sons, 1925), p. 321.

31. In connection with the above, in 1682, a Jumano who had been a prisoner of the Apaches fled to the Sumas because his language was similar to the latter. Since the identity of the Jumano referred to is unknown, the information sheds little light upon the Suma, although it may indicate that some Jumano were Athabascan. See Scholes and Mera, *op. cit.*, p. 288.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

it was mentioned that many Sumas were coming in to settle down and that both Piros and Sumas were already settled at Socorro.

The situation from 1706 to 1773 is not altogether clear. It seems that in 1712, from 1745 to 1751, in 1752 and again in 1772 or 1773 the Sumas, who were settled near El Paso, revolted against the Spanish and joined the Apaches and non-converted Sumas in order to harass Chihuahua. On the other hand, it appears that many Sumas were constantly at war with the Spanish and were never settled in mission-villages. In 1754, Don Thomás Vélez Cachupín said: "These horses of the Natageses [Apaches] are those which they steal in company with the Sumas and Faraones [Apaches] in La Vizcaya and Sonora." He further wants to keep the Carlanas [Jicarilla Apaches] from uniting with the Natageses because "In such case, the Natageses, strengthened by the support and cunning of the Plains Apaches, would develop among the Sumas the greatest boldness, which would result in the total ruin of the frontiers of La Vizcaya and the Real of Chihuahua."[32]

Thus Cachupín clearly implies that in 1754 the Sumas were a large enough group to endanger Chihuahua while in 1744 it was recorded that only fifty families of Zumas were at San Lorenzo.[33] It appears then that the majority of Sumas were probably still nomadic and non-converted in the 1740's and 1750's. More significantly, Cachupín definitely mentions the Sumas as if they were merely one among several Apache groups, not treating them any differently than the Faraones, Natageses, Carlanas and Cuartelejos, all of the latter being known Apache groups.

Another connection between the Sumas and the Apaches is seen in 1725 when Benito, the Bishop of Durango, conferred with ". . . the principal chiefs of the Zuma nation which is so extensive that it occupies more than a hundred

32. Alfred Barnaby Thomas, *The Plains Indians and New Mexico, 1751-1778* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1940), p. 136.

33. Charles W. Hackett, *Historical Documents Relating to New Mexico . . .* (Washington, D. C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1937), Vol. III, p. 406.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

leagues in circumvallation without any fixed settlements."[34] This statement was made in reference to the El Paso area. In the same year, all of the territory to the north, east and, perhaps, west of El Paso was occupied by several Apache groups. (The actual Sumas territory was to the south of El Paso.) Thus it appears that the Bishop denoted Apache territory as being within the "Zuma nation."

The above statement coupled with the Cachupín information establishes the fact that in the 1720's and 1750's the Sumas were still thought of as being a sizeable tribe in Chihuahua and New Mexico. However, Juan A. Baltasar, writing in 1752 from the Sonora-Pimería Alta point of view, says:

> It is certain that in times past the three first nations [jocomes, xamos, summas] were sufficiently well-known, more than now, or they have become consumed, or the little that has remained has been incorporated and confounded with the name of apaches. It isn't known if in some time they were converted, nor if their inconstancy in the faith has won them the name of apostates, *como publica el vulgo*."[35]

Thus in the 1750's, the Sumas of the west had become incorporated under the name of Apaches, while the Sumas of the east were in alliance with the Apaches of that area. The above fact, coupled with the arguments and evidence of the previous pages, indicates the likelihood of an Athabascan linguistic affiliation for the Sumas, especially since it has already been demonstrated for the Janos and Jocomes. Miguel O. de Mendizabal, the author of *La Evolucion del Noroeste de Mexico,* definitely states that the Apaches, Hocomes, Janos and Sumas are all of Athabascan ethnic affiliation, thus agreeing with the above thesis; however, he offers no documentation to reinforce the view.[36]

A final and absolute determination of the linguistic affiliation of the Sumas will have to await the uncovering of

---

34. Sauer, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

35. Juan A. Baltasar, "De Nuevos Progressos," in *Apostolicos Afanes* (Mexico: Luis Alvarez y Alvarez de la Cadeva, 1944), p. 423.

36. Miguel O. de Mendizabal, *La Evolucion del Noroeste de Mexico* (Mexico: Departamento de la Estadistica Nacional, 1930), pp. 115, 116, 120.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico

Forbes, Jack Douglas, ***The Janos, Jocomes, Mansos and Sumas Indians*** , New Mexico Historical Review, 32:4 (1957:Oct.) p.319

further evidence, of course; but, on the basis of the above summary and because of certain cultural evidence one must, for the present, assign an Athabascan identity to the tribe.[37]

37. Bandelier noted in 1883 that one "Suma" remained at El Paso. There Bandelier gathered that the Sumas had been matrilineal (which agrees with the Apaches). He also learned of a war ceremony of the Sumas which was said to resemble a similar Apache dance. A. F. Bandelier, "Investigations Among the Indians of the Southwestern United States," in *Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America*, American Series III (Cambridge: John Wilson and Son, 1890), pp. 87, 89 note.

Since this article was written, several new pieces of evidence have been read. A map of 1735 by Mathew Lentter mentions the "Apaches Hojomes," the "Ianos Sumas" (Janos Sumas), and the "Sumas Jumanes," thus linking the Apaches, Hocomes and Sumas, as well as the southern Jumanes (who were known as Apaches Jumanes in Texas and northern Mexico from at least 1729). Likewise, a statement by Governor Don Antonio de Otermín in 1683 indicates that the Mansos spoke the same language as the Janos. *New Mexico Archives, 1621-1683*, doc. 16. Coronado Library, University of New Mexico.—J. D. F.

Copyright (c) 2006 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) University of New Mexico